

Friends Bulletin

PACIFIC AND NORTH PACIFIC YEARLY MEETINGS OF THE RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS

VOLUME 43, NUMBER 3

NOVEMBER, 1974

One Perspective on Human Sexuality

The most remarkable thing about Pacific Yearly Meeting, to me, is the depth and richness of our communication with one another. We are in very truth a laboratory and an organism; a whole that really *is* more than the sum of its parts. Known and valued across the years, we observe and share in one another's lives. We see what people do and how they behave when tragedy strikes, when death comes, when children and adults "find themselves," when parents can share in the pride and recognition of their young, and when sub-groups follow through on their basic concerns, interests and life-styles.

It is from this matrix, this cauldron, that our value system — or perhaps I should say systems — as a religious society arise. They bubble up from the alchemies we mix in the kettles we hammer out of the hard metals of our daily experiences. Hopefully, they are clarified in our meetings for worship, for business, and in special talking meetings.

I attended the first session of the interest group on human sexuality requested by the High School Friends at PYM, an "open" talking meeting.

Over and over again in that meeting the refrain, "I don't want to hurt anybody," was repeated, and one could observe the struggle for "conscience" going on. There was a dim sensing that we were discussing something that had power to curse, bless, or transform. But as the session progressed, I found myself feeling that the kind of freedom being discussed called for a great deal of clarification.

One of my favorite college professors used to define sex as "all of one's relationships to all of life." That clarified a lot of things for me, and I recommend it as a framework for searching out the ethics and morality of sexual behavior in the wider democratic society of our country and in the Religious Society of Friends.

It is said that once one opens the door to sexual intercourse, that door is never again closed. Is the timing of this epoch related to a broad spectrum of other choices? Does the imperative NOW which I felt so strongly in that PYM session include a sense of the past and a reach toward the future? Does it include a concept of loving as well as being loved? What do we need to know and who is really

involved in one's "free choice" in sexual behavior? Is it true that the well-being of the individual and of the group are related? What about the economics of sex? How far, and whom do we trust? Who is responsible to whom?

As I observed that group and participated in it, there arose in me a question which holds a true concern: "Has the time indeed come when we need a widely experienced resource person in this field to be with us during Yearly Meeting?" — a person such as Mary Calderone of SIECUS* or someone she might suggest. My feeling is that there are people in our groups who are very unequally informed, involved, and committed, and that we really require someone broadly experienced in the total field to provide specialized knowledge, understanding, and insight. Someone who spans the complexities of time and content, and who can relate on-going groups to one another.

I did not go back to the second called session of the human sexuality group. The revolution that has taken place within my lifetime was, I felt, too great to be emotionally and intellectually encompassed in the time allotted for that meeting.

As I try to keep my perspective about that particular meeting, the obvious seems relevant, namely, that "sex" is many things to many people in our meetings. In my opinion, we need someone like Mary Calderone to help us. Then, under the guidance of our own able clerks, we can continue to tell one another what we are experiencing — and we can grow in understanding, in knowledge, and in compassion.

I well recall the winter my soul was kept alive by a Friend friend who appeared twice a week in the early morning — on her way to work — with a tray of camellias!

What does this have to do with an article on human sexuality?

EVERYTHING!

Molly Morgenroth

*Mary Calderone is a physician, a Quaker, and a grandmother. She has served since 1964 as the executive director of the Sex Information and Education Council of the U. S.: SIECUS. Her pamphlet, *Human Sexuality and the Quaker Conscience*, is available from Friends General Conference, 1520 Race St., Philadelphia, PA 19102, for \$1.00.

FRIENDS BULLETIN

2081 Amherst St., Palo Alto, CA 94306

Telephone: (415) 321-9958

Robert R. Schutz, *Editor*Myra Keen, *Assistant to the Editor*Barbara Janoe, *Corresponding Editor for NPYM*

The official organ of news and opinion of Pacific Yearly Meeting and North Pacific Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends.

Second Class postage paid at Palo Alto, California.

PUBLISHED monthly except February and August at 2081 Amherst St., Palo Alto, California 94306. All correspondence, editorial and subscription, should be directed to mailing address above. Deadline for copy is fifth of the month preceding month of issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$3.50 per year. First class postage \$6.00. Monthly Meetings are encouraged to collect and subscribe for all of their members. Contributions beyond subscriptions are welcomed to help meet actual costs and reduce Yearly Meeting subsidies. All contributions are tax deductible; receipts sent on request.

ADVERTISEMENTS: \$0.35 donation per line, subject to approval of content.

NORTH PACIFIC YEARLY MEETING OFFICERS

Presiding Clerk, 1975: Monette Thatcher, 1812 Villard St., Eugene, OR 97403

Recording Clerk, 1975: (to be appointed)

Chairman, Steering Committee: Joseph Stritmatter, 8031 124th Ave., N. E., Kirkland, WA 98033

Treasurer: Ellis Jump, 3027 N. E. Ainsworth, Portland, OR 97211

Archivist: Kenneth Holmes, 410 Orchard, Monmouth, OR 97361

Registrar: Mildred Burck, 916A N.W. Sequoia Ave., Corvallis, OR 97330

Arrangements Clerk: Lee Bennett, 2032 E. Newton St., Seattle, WA 98112

Program Committee Clerk: Jay Thatcher, 1812 Villard St., Eugene, OR 97403

PACIFIC YEARLY MEETING OFFICERS

Presiding Clerk: Peggmae H. Lacey, 128 7th Ave., San Francisco, CA 94118

Assistant Clerk: David Tappan, 1938 Rose Villa, Pasadena, CA 91107

Recording Clerks: Marilyn Heilman, 5730 Shepard Ave., Sacramento, CA 95819

Lowell Tozer, 1074 Merritt Dr., El Cajon, CA 92020

Reading Clerk: Nancy Springer, 3218 Baker St., Berkeley, CA 94702

Statistical Clerk: Elizabeth Draper, 1611 Clemson Dr., Davis, CA 95616

Treasurers: Frank and Stephanie (Assistant) Burnham, P. O. Box 602, Reno, NV 89504

Historian-Archivist: Etta Vogel, 1678 Casitas Ave., Pasadena, CA 91103

Junior Yearly Meeting Clerk: Winnie White, 134 Meadow Lane, Orinda, CA 94563

On Human Freedom and Sexuality

I wish we had a transcript of the heavily attended two-session Interest Group bearing the above label, which was sponsored by Junior Friends at PYM 1974. Since we don't, our memories may differ over what light was shed there. For me, the words uttered were mostly dull, unlighted evidence of spoken delinquency. There was, as Brian Heilman tells us (p. 33), a lot of communication between young people and adults. Mostly one-way, I would say. The adults listened.

It seemed to me that Friends heard much youthful braggadocio mixed with some gentle yearnings for a finer vision. No one seemed to know what that vision was, or attempted to express it. Crassness, self-contempt, alienation, and exploitation were all trotted forth in their sordid lack of variety for the appalled consideration of those who could muster the stomach to stay. One great spirit was so sickened, she could not return for the second session.

The adults were mostly cowed into silence because they were a minority, because they wanted to show respect and listen to the young, and because they are continually told by psychologically oriented peers that they shouldn't say anything: — we cannot transmit values by talk, we turn off kids when we try to "lay our trip" on them (what language!), and we endanger communication of precious jewels by opening our minds and hearts. That, to me, is balderdash.

We are indebted to Junior Friends for opening these subjects with us, for the implicit trust they show and the seeking for beauty, light, and love that peeps through the crevices like the first flowers of spring around hard rocks of prejudice, fear, and ego inflation. We can respond with no less than the best that is in us. I hope that Friends will find informative and helpful the answers to hard questions I have posed far and wide among us, and here record in this issue of the *Bulletin*.

RRS

Junior High Clerk: Barbara Beck, 291 Harsin Lane, Santa Maria, CA 93454

Young Friends Clerk: Carolyn Bradshaw, 2013 Lincoln St., Berkeley, CA 94709

YFNA Representative: Michele Rudenko, 1525 Milvia St., Berkeley, CA 94709

Young Friends Clerk:

PYM Registrar: Nancy Burnett, 835 Ross Court, Palo Alto, CA 94303

PYM Arrangements Clerk: John Fitz, 1043 Sierra St., Berkeley, CA 94707

Assistant Arrangements Clerk: Micki Graham, 3218 Baker St., Berkeley, CA 94702

Transmission of Values

In the first place, I guess I don't want to *transmit* values; i.e., take *My* values or what *I* think is right and put them on *You*. What I would hope for is that in *My* dealings with *You* (especially if you are a young person), I treat you in such a way as to allow *You* to formulate and arrive at values that will work for *You*, that will be the best ones you could arrive at. (We feel that our role as Junior Friends' Advisors is not to impose our values, but to allow their values a new chance to grow and develop.)

It is probably obvious to say that the worst way to lead anyone toward values of which you approve is to dictate, tell, or talk. Too often Talk is what we do when we don't know what to do! And the best way (again, it's been said before) is to live by them yourself. I don't mean the old "set a good example" thing. That can amount to little more than "telling;" that is, without speaking, you say, "See what I do. Now you do it, too!"

I guess what I mean is that you have to be honest with yourself and with others, especially about your feelings. I need to know myself and hopefully, out of this knowing, I will acquire a genuine respect for myself. With this knowledge and *respect* I will know what to *expect* of myself. And I feel that we need to treat the person we are relating to with the same respect, to take the responsibility of discovering who he is enough to know what to expect of him. Both of us will feel more successful when He lives up to *My* expectations.

Finally, you ask what values I would like to see our young people live by, regarding sex, drugs, and theft. Well, my immediate response is that what *I* would like is sort of irrelevant. It would be easy to say I'd like them to be chaste, to avoid drugs and alcohol, and to be completely honest in every way. That would make things so easy! There wouldn't be any problem, and we wouldn't be writing articles like this! But that's not where they are, and to insist that they *should* be there is to avoid facing reality.

This statement *does not* mean that I condone promiscuity, drugs, and ripping-off! But we do have to admit that they exist to at least some degree among many of our young people. (Only *young* people?) And I think we have to study our feelings about these things and our attitudes toward people who *do* these things. I certainly don't know the answers, but I think about possible answers a lot, and the ideas that keep making the most sense seem to involve *respect* — Real respect, not fear. Respect for self, for others, and

expectation, and *responsibility*, again toward self, toward others. By our actions and feelings (and, in my opinion, less than ten percent of our words), we communicate to people how much we respect them and how much we expect from them.

If we (all of us) can learn to maintain an attitude of respect for ourselves, our bodies, our feelings, for others, for their bodies, for their feelings — and if we can behave responsibly toward ourselves and others, and respect others enough to expect responsible behavior from them, and if this is true respect and real responsibility — then I think the experiences we have involving sex and drugs and other people's property will be satisfying and satisfactory experiences.

Barbara (and Ed) Janoe

The Happy Word from John Woolman School

Thanks to the many Friends in Pacific Yearly Meeting who have responded to the grave financial problems of John Woolman School, we can report that we are in a steadier place this year than last, with an enrollment of fifty-three students (up from thirty-six in September, 1973). Twenty-three students (43%) are from Friends families, which is the highest percentage of Quakers we have ever had — a real delight to us. Two students are with us on scholarships totaling \$5300 given by their Meeting.

Twenty-five students (fifteen Quakers) have received from the school a total of \$47,065 in tuition reduction. The average tuition reduction is about \$1900. More students applied for tuition reduction this year than ever before. In order to enable us to be a community more representative of the larger population, we felt it important to insure places for students whose economic background might otherwise prevent their participation. Therefore, having budgeted only \$17,000 for tuition reduction, we shall still operate with a small deficit this year.

Our housing facilities are inadequate for girls, who number more than half the student population at thirty-two. Rooms in the dormitory which contained two beds last year are now crowded with three, and two girls are living in the infirmary. Plans to remodel the dormitory lounge into two makeshift rooms are underway. Because of this lack of housing space, we cannot accept any more girls at the semester, but we could accommodate boys, who now number only twenty-one.

Shirley Tweed

Interview on Values

WITH LAURELYN BARNES

Q. Let's talk about truth. Do you always tell it?

A. Not always. Not if it is likely to hurt someone. But it depends on the law. I won't cover for someone who breaks the law.

Q. What if it is a bad law?

A. Well, then I would have to decide.

Q. So then you set yourself above the law?

A. I guess so. In some cases, I would obey the law.

Q. If your parents were hiding a deserting soldier on his way to Canada, and the policeman came to the door. . . .

A. I would take every measure to keep him out of the hands of the law.

Q. Even if this means ultimately that you and all of your family go to jail?

A. I would do what I could unless it hassles too many people. I would hide him if I was right and could get away with it.

Q. Does this not open the door to every kind of deceit and dishonesty in government and business?

A. There is a difference between me and the people in Washington. What I do affects fewer people.

Q. Do people in public office have to be more honest than you?

A. Yes, they do. When you're a teenager, you get hassled for everything. If you get into trouble for it just because you're young, then you might as well do something wrong. I guess truth telling is not one of my strong points.

Q. What is your attitude toward work?

A. There is a lot that has to be done. I ought to do my share, but not more. If I have to do more than my share, then it becomes expected; then I can't get out of it.

Q. Do you think you as a woman should work?

A. I expect to work most of my life. But I think a teenager should have a chance to do some things she wants to do before she has to settle down and work. I am not planning to marry for money. If money is that important to someone, I say, "Forget it." I would rather be the important part of the life of the person I marry.

Q. Should women take equal responsibility with men in supporting the family?

A. No, I think the man should support the family if he can. Women should do volunteer work if the job market is small. The woman should work for money only if it is needed.

Q. What about work around the house?

A. It should be shared, depending on ability and the amount of time people have. If I don't do something, Dorene does it all. The rest of the family don't do much of anything. Dorene and Bob have never made any of us do work. But it has to be done to keep the family from getting really angry.

Q. Do you think men and women should be treated equally?

A. Some jobs shouldn't be for women, they are too dangerous. Men are bigger, and women shouldn't play some sports: baseball, or football, for example.

Q. What about the jobs around the house?

A. If the man's job is physical labor, then the woman should do the physical labor at home. But men should still do some of it.

Q. How do you feel about premarital sex, say for teenagers?

A. For me, for the next four to six years, it is not worth it to go into sex. There is too much chance of getting pregnant. And that would be a big burden on the guy. We are not old enough to take some responsibilities. I don't approve of teenagers having premarital sex at all. But I don't tell people not to do it.

Q. Is fear of pregnancy your only reason for disapproval?

A. No, but it is the main one. Sex is a deep expression of love, and until you are most of the way through growing emotionally, you can't tell whom you're going to love next week. It should be done with the person you love and plan to stay with for life. I am not ready for marriage. I have too many things to decide for myself. I may change a lot over the next couple of years. I am not old enough emotionally to handle it.

Q. Do your peers hassle you about your ideas on sex?

A. Yes. Some try to talk me out of them, and some ridicule me. I have old-fashioned ideas, but those old standards worked better. I don't need those who tell me how to run my life differently.

Q. Do you wish your standards were different than they are?

A. In relation to equality or sex. I would like to be completely honest, but society and the laws don't let me. I can't believe that some laws are right, like those against war resisters and draft dodgers. And bribery on a large scale is wrong. With respect to work, I have to decide how I want it different before I can change it.

Q. Has this process of acculturation that you have participated in for 16 years been satisfactory to you?

(Continued on page 42)

Interview on Values

WITH BRIAN HEILMAN

Q. You seem in conversation to set great store on openness and honesty. Do you always tell the truth?

A. Yes, I think so.

Q. Suppose your family were hiding a draft resister on his way to Canada, and the policeman came to the door and asked you if he was in there. Would you say yes or no?

A. In order to be true to myself and honest in that situation, I think I would not say either one. I would say I do not choose to answer that question.

Q. If your best friend were acting like a boor or a slob or a pig, would you tell him so even though it hurt him?

A. There are many ways of getting a point across without saying it directly. And I wouldn't have to say it at all. I could keep my own counsel.

Q. Honesty tends to produce pain, either to the victim or the executioner. Do you, then, choose to inflict pain, either on yourself or on another, rather than be dishonest?

A. I don't believe you have to inflict pain. There is always a way you can say it or act it without much pain. I haven't experienced much pain.

Q. Do you think your life has been fairly painless because you have been surrounded by love and because your parents are very permissive?

A. I have been surrounded by love, but my parents aren't all that permissive. I've had plenty of rules, and sometimes resented them and sometimes broke them.

Q. And you've always been honest about having broken them?

A. Yes, they always find out, one way or another.

Q. No pain?

A. Oh, we have big hassles and huge blowups, but then everybody feels better. That's not bad.

Q. If you were drafted into the army and went, you would be faced with all kinds of stupid rules and regulations that you would not observe. Would you always report your violations and bring on yourself the punishment?

A. No, I don't think so.

Q. How does that square with your feeling for being honest?

A. It depends on what the others in the situation are doing. If they are being dishonest, it gives you some latitude.

Q. Does this not open the barn door? Can't you always say the establishment is being dishonest? Doesn't this make way for Watergates?

A. Well, maybe. But it changes your responsibility when others are being dishonest. Then it is not necessary to be honest, to them.

Q. How do you feel about work?

A. I've had it drilled into me that work is good. My father thinks it is a necessity of life. At first I didn't get the point, but now I like it a lot.

Q. How did you happen to come around?

A. I've always had a degree of freedom about work, especially related to school. And lately, I've been developing a social conscience, which makes a difference.

Q. So purpose is an essential ingredient?

A. That's true. A lot of my friends say why work; what do you do it for? I don't like that attitude. It depends on how you define it. There's work that you see as important, and then there's work that you do for money — so you can get something else. The first is always good. But the second depends on what you're doing it for. To support your family, great; to buy dope, bad. It is nice to be able to get money for what you think is important.

Q. Do you believe that women should work to support the family as well as men?

A. Yes, but no one should get a lot of money for little work when others are getting little money for a lot of work.

Q. Should there be equal responsibility for bringing up children?

A. I'm not sure. Too many parents can give a child confusing messages. I don't know how it would be growing up in a Kibbutz.

Q. What is your own attitude toward sex, say, among teenagers, before marriage?

A. I have no qualms about that at all. I have never felt that sex should be confined just to the marriage relationship. I never got that message.

Q. What about promiscuity, then? Should one have sex with anyone, anytime?

A. I would not just go out with someone and say, well, would you like to have sex with me? Sex is not the initial need or purpose of a relationship, but an outgrowth. There are many dimensions to a relationship. I think it might be nice to have a relationship just for sex, but I would probably be very disappointed. I think there would be nothing there.

Q. What do you think about marriage, then?

A. I think marriage and sex are kind of disjointed, unrelated. I'm sure that marriage is a kind of special thing. It's a way for Society to wish good luck, or show their trust in two people who have already established a relationship. Marriage is not the start of a relationship, as it used to be. It is changing, for the better.

(Continued on page 42)

Notes from the Meetings

(N. B. We read your letters and Meeting Newsletters sedulously for items of interest to all of us. We have written to all of the Clerks asking for materials and have heard from about one-third of you. If your news does not appear here from time to time, we would urge you to appoint Bulletin correspondents and send us your letters. — Ed.)

General

Elfrida Vipont Foulds, well known British Quaker author, spoke at a number of West Coast meetings during the summer, as mentioned in several of the newsletters, notably *La Jolla*, *Palo Alto*, and *Santa Monica*.

Fund raising activities were varied, all addressed to Quaker goals:

- *University Meeting* in Seattle held its annual Slide Show and Pie Feast, as a benefit for Friend in the Orient.
- *Santa Monica* held an all-day Banjo and Fiddle Contest, which netted \$5,500 for AFSC.
- *San Jose* held a Vietnam Festival in support of the work at Quang Ngai with which Dorothy Weller has been associated.
- *Palo Alto* staged its annual Harvest Festival, for the benefit of the FCL, and netted approximately \$7,000.

Santa Barbara Meeting is concerned that the average age of its members is increasing. Eighteen members in 1956 had an average age of 55. There are 38 nominal members now — average age 53 — but when one looks at the resident active members, one finds an average age of 62. Are other meetings losing youth and life? Some European meetings definitely are. It would be interesting to make comparisons if other meetings can come up with data on their memberships.

San Jose has been experimenting with a two-year cycle for its meeting schedule: one year, Meeting for Worship at 10 a.m. with the children present the first 15 minutes, and a discussion hour at 11; alternating the next year with discussion the first hour, Meeting for Worship at 11, with the children present the last 15 minutes. An alternation of business meeting times is also planned.

University Meeting is experimenting with a brown-bag lunch after Meeting for Worship, to give newcomers a chance to become acquainted, members bringing enough lunch so there can be sharing of food with visitors who are unprepared.

Social Action

Seattle Meeting participated in a demonstration on Chile, as part of the Seattle Liberation Coalition.

Olympia Worship Group, in cooperation with AFSC and the IndoChina Peace Campaign, coordinated local appearances of Jean-Pierre Debris, a former French prisoner in Saigon, and managed to get good media coverage for at least one of his several public lectures on Saigon prison conditions.

During the Week of Concern on Vietnam and the Indochina Peace Campaign several meetings sponsored public demonstrations of various sorts; *Santa Barbara*, among others, reported favorable media attention.

Letters or Minutes on Amnesty have been drafted by several meetings, in addition to PYM's Minute, notably *Eastside*, *Multnomah* and *Palo Alto*.

La Jolla Meeting has been especially active on the problem of World Hunger, and notice of their concern was publicized by Friends World Committee (Section of the Americas) in its October newsletter on Right Sharing of World Resources. *La Jolla* also planned a workshop on the perils of growth, for October, and hopes to get a working group of Amnesty International organized in *La Jolla* to aid in the worldwide concern about the increasing use of torture as a political weapon.

Claremont Meeting, in stressing the need for simpler living standards in America, points out that if all Americans were to eat ¼ pound less hamburger per week, the saving in grain would be 10 million tons, the amount that India will need this year to stave off malnutrition or outright starvation of millions of its people.

Vital

Births:

To Jane and Joe Gaston of University Meeting, a son, Stuart Hyman, born July 6.

To Shelley and John Schubert of Santa Monica, a daughter, Rebecca, born July 28. Mother, grandparents, and an aunt and uncle are members of Santa Monica Meeting.

Marriages:

John Salyer and Marybeth Clark, Honolulu, June 16.

Colwell Beatty and Katherine Franks, Santa Barbara, May 18.

(Continued on page 35)

A Worldly Assembly of Men

Being orderly come together you are not to spend time with needless, unnecessary and fruitless discourses, but to proceed in the wisdom of God not in the way of the world, as a worldly assembly of men, by hot contests, by seeking to outspoke and overreach one another in discourse as if it were controversy between party and party of men, or two sides violently striving for dominion . . . but in the wisdom, love and fellowship of God, in gravity, patience, meekness . . . in coolness, gentleness and dear unity. . . .

Edward Burrough, 1662

Friends' fourth century in the United States has seen the shattering of cultural Quakerism including such outward and visible signs as plain speech and dress and the avoidance of titles. Probably we see the end of these customs without regret. However, Pacific Yearly Meeting in its sessions just past recorded the death of more inward and spiritual aspects of the Quaker counter-culture. In this event I see cause for sorrow.

I list first the trivialization of our business meetings as in the needless and fruitless discourse on nude bathing as a part of the scheduled events of Yearly Meeting. That some Friends espouse it should not surprise us, for public nudity has become so commonplace in our country that a candidate for public office recently adopted it in seeking support. At the beginning of this three-hour discussion, we were reminded that a meeting on the needs of the striking grape-workers had been scheduled for part of that time. Instead we considered the therapeutic and spiritual effects of nude bathing. Surely this is a reversal of values from the time of the opening of our history, for no sooner had Christ Jesus spoken to his condition than George Fox ran to a meeting of judges in Mansfield gathered to set the wages of farm workers. Fox exhorted the judges not to oppress the workers in their wages.

A second piece of evidence may be more far reaching in that it shows the end of the spirit of worship which is urged upon us in our first query concerning Meetings for Business. When the Social Order Committee brought in a minute which asked for a full publication of the facts concerning the corruption of the presidential administration which we had seen come to an end just before the opening of our sessions, there was prompt approval. Then followed an extended uproar of shouts and laughter one would expect to hear at a party convention.

It may be that we do not see in our vision of the future that Pacific Yearly Meeting will ever hold Meetings for Business such as Edward Burrough described which carry on their business without hot contests, outspeaking and overreaching one another as if it were controversy between party and party of men, but visions become reality if we care enough.

Madge T. Seaver

NOTES FROM MEETINGS

(Continued from page 34)

Terril Cosgray and Elizabeth Johnson, Santa Barbara, September 21.

(Marriages mentioned in newsletters as scheduled, which probably have occurred):

Carolyn Werner and Lawrence Ball, Claremont, October 12.

Midi Cox of Honolulu and Larry Kimball, at Orange Grove, August 25.

Deaths:

Tess Helburn, in Bozeman, Montana, October 1. She and her husband, Nick, started Missoula Meeting in the 1940s and both were active in AFSC work, especially on behalf of Montana Indians.

Ella Lee Cowgill, La Jolla Meeting, July 10, at age 92. Memorial meeting was held July 20.

Personal

Edwin Sanders, Clerk of PYM from 1970 to 1973, a member of Orange Grove Meeting, has been chosen as leader of the new administrative team at Pendle Hill beginning September 1, with the title of Executive Clerk. His wife, Marian, will work at Pendle Hill, although not in an official capacity.

Mildred Thiermann, formerly of Palo Alto Meeting, has been acting as registrar at Pendle Hill during the summer.

Calendar

Arizona Half-Yearly Meeting sends a report that 75 members and attenders of the four Arizona meetings convened on October 12 at Pima Meetinghouse in Tucson. This was the 19th session of this Half-Yearly Meeting, which continued until noon of October 13. Next meeting will be at Tempe, Arizona, in the spring of 1975.

North Pacific Yearly Meeting will return to Fort Worden State Park in July next year for Yearly Meeting.

What Is This Nudity Thing All About, Anyway?

(From Notes on Session IX, PYM 1974)

The Agenda Review Committee placed the subject before the Session, and the Clerk noted that although the subject was not referred to the College this year, St. Mary's issued an edict forbidding nude swimming. The question still before the Meeting: "Shall nude swimming be permitted at PYM?" "While we are here four or five days together, we are a special community, different, unique, with a life of its own. Like a family, we will consider what we do in the light of our life together in that community, not any other."

*One who swims nude: It is very hard to find another place as good as St. Mary's.

*We are guests here. This is a precious five days.

*Some of us, and only some, prefer to swim nude.

*This is not a trivial matter. Nude swimming has made changes in my life. We are dealing with feelings about ourselves, our bodies, our liberties.

*This is so complex it is futile to dialogue about it now.

*The Interest Group on Nudity produced and read a statement: As Friends, we affirm the Light Within which leads each of us to follow it in our own way. For some of us, the nude experience has been a time of joy, bringing a new sense of worth and dignity and a greater spirit of wholeness, both within ourselves and among each other.

"Being a Society of Friends, we seek to exercise discretion in our practices in respect of others' sensitivities, nor do we wish to force our practices on the entire group. We seek rather to have Friends recognize that the human body *is* sacred, that it houses that in us which is infinite and divine. Accepting our bodies hits to the core of caring, sharing, and accepting each other. We as Friends share the innermost searchings and revelations of our souls. May we not also cherish and respect the temple that surrounds it?"

*I am concerned that some of us not view actions of others as immoral. The question includes an un-Quakerly element: coercion. To me, coercion of any kind of action by others is immoral.

*This is obscene, not immoral. While most of the world is hungry, most rights are not resolved, we are talking about the same violence as deciding how long should be the hem of this skirt. This is not a matter of death or life for anyone.

*I have been a nudist for many years, have suppressed it in order not to compromise my pacifism. Now I believe that the joy, love, and

happiness it brings will bring out the goodness in people. We will naturally make the United Nations work, and not oppress the farm workers. That is why it is *very* important.

*This year, we have sharing groups. Are they in the same category as nude swimming? Let us leave this question until we have the evaluation of sharing groups.

*This is not the same as sharing groups; there is no desire to exclude.

*I am troubled by the intolerance toward the attitudes of other Friends. We seem to be able to tolerate Richard Nixon. This is why it is important.

*People are not close enough. Nude swimming brings people closer.

*I don't know why PYM must approve. I enjoy wine, but this subject is not worth bringing up at PYM. We don't have to make a decision. Like drinking or vegetarianism, it is my privilege. It is not obscene or wrong.

*There is more to the issue, which is not immorality. Clothes are a communication system, which contains habits of growing up, relationships, stories, myths. PYM is not the place to explore a complex new development.

*It is a step in my growth, not trivial. This is my family. I'd love to have the freedom to explore these risks.

*Years ago, our boys and those we sponsored went back and told their friends, "Wow, Quakers are nudists." There is concern among parents that we lay this kind of decision making on the young, who have to respond to cries of "Oh, you're chicken."

*I remember an old Friend who was upset at dancing. Let us wait, and be receptive to what others wish. When we are ready, perhaps we will know. We don't all have to approve everything.

*I would propose a minute: We are aware of the value and meaning of nude swimming to a number of us. PYM considers this experience viable, but not a necessary activity of PYM. (The minute was not accepted.)

*No one has said we can or cannot dance.

*Four years ago, Young Friends asked the College officials if they could swim nude, and were granted permission. It made the Quakers really whole. My son said: "Wow! Two hundred naked Quakers." Quakers are doing it wherever else they wish. It is a matter of facing it and relaxing about it. This was a beautiful experience. It brought young and old together, and did much for the growth of my son.

*I like it and take every opportunity to do it. But this would set up terrible barriers to some we want to associate with. It would keep them home. It is a question of time.

*We do not have unity; let us let it go for the moment.

*It is not a clear issue. We cannot answer unless we can ask the question. The signs point to no unity on the question now. And it is not permitted now. Wise things have been said tonight about how we care for each other. PYM is making small steps forward.

*I do not agree. It is not decided. There is no unity either way.

*It is clear there is no unity. I am uncomfortable with the wording that we are not permitted.

*You are not ready yet. But you will have it before you until you are ready.

*This evening we have revealed ourselves to one another, in a loving way. This is important; I am grateful; it was worth the time.

*We don't have unity here on permission. We don't have unity here on what that means. We must trust one another.

*The Clerk tried for a Minute: Friends agree that nude swimming is not permitted and that we will not have nude swimming until it is permitted. (This was not agreed.)

*Let us remain civil and stop talking about love.

*The question is still open. If the college changed its mind, nude swimming might happen.

*The wording is wrong.

*The Clerk: we can't even ask the question.

*We need time to season this.

*A Minute was approved: There is no unity on the question.

*I might resolve this. I am used to acts of civil disobedience. Friends are not my conscience. I will not be bound. If Yearly Meeting feels I have to be excluded, that will have to be their action.

*It is time to express kindness, charity to one another, especially the Clerk. Let us lay it down, giving time to settle in the future.

*I am not happy. I would disapprove smoking, but smoking has never been scheduled. This Yearly Meeting is not my conscience. It dictates what it sets up and schedules for its own meetings.

*No minute is required as to our lack of unity. The Clerk gathers the sense of the meeting. It is not a matter of substituting words. There is no yes, and there is no no. What that means is very specific. It means there is a third state that is common only to Friends. It means that nothing

happened on it. We are not in unity. It would be a sad experience to act out of that unity (that we are not in unity).

*It means that none of us gets what we want. We have to be considerate.

*This is a new action, a new thing. We do not take action on a new thing. It can't be a Yearly Meeting function. If an individual does something different, the Executive Committee will deal with it in view of the unity of Yearly Meeting.

*It is the Clerk's *interpretation* that we will not swim in the nude until we can agree to permit this activity. (There was disagreement on this interpretation.)

*In the silence that closed this Meeting: I stand in opposition to minuting that we are not in unity. We do not have unity. To minute that we don't have unity is wrong. It is a hellish game. We just haven't found it yet.

*For twenty-odd years, I have always felt a part of Friends. But for a moment tonight, I felt strange looking at these people. I thought, how did I get into the wrong place, until this moment of silence.

PYM Sharing Group Evaluation: *Women*

Closed sharing groups were held Thursday and Friday afternoons from 3:30 to 5:00. Also, women met at 9:30 p.m. Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. The last evening session lasted until 2:30 a.m.

This year, no men appeared as have appeared in the last three years. We think there were anywhere from 50 to 70 participants. We did not take roll. The sharing was on a deep personal level and seemed very valuable to most. Topics were chosen afresh at each meeting. It was generally agreed that PYM is most conducive to almost instant trust, and therefore, people open up quickly. Listening to comments from those who have shared in previous years, it seemed evident that much personal growth has occurred as a result of deep sharing from year to year. Apparently, in this very special setting among Friends with the emphasis on active listening, there is a ministry that is helpful and healing. Many who came last year found themselves not needing to share this year, and felt free to participate in other activities.

Billie Hamilton

Quakerism, Sex, and the Emperor's New Clothes

(Condensed and Reprinted from *Friends Journal*, September 1, 1974; Copyright Friends Publishing Corporation.)

Just within the past two years a crowd of people have gotten together and talked about bisexuality at the Friends General Conferences in Ithaca and Richmond; the *Friends Journal* has published two news items on bisexuality (September 1, 1972, and April 1, 1974), both written by Bob Martin; and a Committee of Friends on Bisexuality has been announced and Committee letterhead has been printed, with Bob Martin as Clerk and with an unannounced number of members and without any connection with any Friends organization.

Out of all this has come a minute of Baltimore Yearly Meeting, 1973, with the statement that "the myths about bisexuality and homosexuality, myths that perpetuate deeply rooted discrimination, need to be dispelled through educational efforts", and a mimeographed list of "Questions for Bisexuality Discussion Group, Friends General Conference, 1973," in which Question No. 4 reads: "Can I approach sex with people of either gender in the same spirit?"

If I have to pass *that* test in order to be a good Quaker liberal, I may as well give up and join the reactionaries. In my benighted vocabulary sex with *people* — plural — is called lechery. As for sex with people of both sexes — I didn't even have a word for that in my vocabulary till this new cult of bisexuality came along.

Sexual tendencies are one thing, but sexual practices are quite another. If bisexuality really exists as a tendency distinct from homosexuality, then recognition of its existence as a *tendency* no more justifies bisexuality *in practice* than recognition of a normal heterosexual tendency justifies polygamy, wife-swapping, or other kinds of fornication.

Running through the statement by Baltimore Yearly Meeting and those distributed by this new Committee of Friends on Bisexuality is the implication that anyone who insists on making value judgments about any form of sexual activity is guilty of bigotry. This assumption needs to be critically examined.

If Friends are willing to "develop positive attitudes" toward the sexuality of those who feel the need to have sex relations with both men and women, then are they willing also to tolerate polygamy within the Society of Friends? If not, why not? (Don't try to wiggle out of that question

by saying polygamy is against the law; if polygamy deserves the support of Friends, then Friends have the duty to try to change the law.)

And are Friends willing to look upon Quakerly wife-swapping with "openness and loving understanding"? If not, why not? And what about prostitution? If Friends accept bisexuality, are they also ready to "develop positive attitudes" toward some enterprising young woman in their meeting who decides to earn her living by peddling her body? If not, why not?

The 1965 edition of *Faith and Practice* of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting cautions Friends about gambling and the use of tobacco, alcohol, and drugs, but says not a word against indulgence by members in bisexual activity, polygamy, wife-swapping, or prostitution. These questions cannot be brushed aside as "ridiculous." They are a logical extension of the state of mind that is encouraging Friends to tolerate the practice of bisexuality. If some of the questions shock most readers of the *Bulletin*, this will be a hopeful sign about the future of the Society of Friends.

At this time in human history when the control of venereal disease and pregnancies has undermined the old sexual morality based on fear, the Society of Friends will be unworthy of its heritage if it timidly drifts along with the crowd that is preaching a new "morality" based on the divorce of sex from love and the acceptance of anything two or more persons may be willing to indulge in together for the sake of a sexual thrill.

The power of sex is like the power of water. The dam that a civilization builds on a roaring mountain torrent does indeed inhibit the free flow of the stream, but that inhibiting dam not only protects the valley below against uncontrolled floods, it also raises the level of the water and channels its power in constructive directions. Similarly, the dam of civilized restraints is responsible for raising the level of the sexual drive to the point where two human beings are able to share a love that transcends their physical pleasure and fills their lives with spiritual meaning.

Friends have usually not hesitated very much to take unpopular public positions on social and political issues — pacifism, for example, or relations with the Soviet Union, relations with China, the war in Vietnam, or the Middle East. I approve and support such statements. The time has come now for Friends to show the same courage in speaking out on the question of sexual conduct. Now that we are being exhorted in

(Continued on page 44)

A Meditation Upon the Meaning of Sex

For me, sex has always been for the creative purpose — to conceive the child of flesh or Spirit. I have not always been able to live true to this awareness — for sometimes I sought it in dry and barren places — believing such sweet communion was possible, discovering it was not.

Very early it was for exploring the mystery of my body — the mystery of my body linked in love with another — for learning about the opening bud of myself. Then it was to bear children — those bright spirits, leaning heavenward, whom I can sometime follow in my heart. Once it was for my healing — for healing my vision of myself. At another time, I gave myself freely because I saw that others needed this same healing from me. All of these were journeys of my Spirit, and they were right.

There was a long span of time when my Spirit said no to any sex. Something else needed growing in me then.

At yet another time I discovered, through sex, that I was at the live-point of new creation. So great a creativity flowed through me I could not rest or sleep, but life and my creative energies fused in some phoenix fire, and I tirelessly burned in its pure, clear flame.

Today I move slowly, cautiously through the realm of sex... dawn-delicately. Today it has come as a gift from the sea of life whose waves roll toward me at intervals — and I am the wide beach receiving — whose waves roll back, leaving me cleansed and sun-washed and fresh.

At this place in my time, my sexual life is one of shared experience and of wonder. I am discovering its depth and quietening. I am re-discovering the miracle and the mystery of my body — a new reverence for it; a new awareness of its multiplicity of possibilities — that it can encompass uttermost and exquisite pain and longing and joy and delight. It is awakening me to the sounds and silences of the universe, and the whispers and breathings of my Spirit. And, it's fun!

Today, it's not for shutting doors to feeling — but for flinging them open wide. It does not anesthetize me; it sharpens all my perceptions. It's for expanding out, for including, for embracing, for growing, for feeling more of everything.

But — I walk a narrow line in sex. Indeed, I walk a path of holy obedience. Because it does speak so deeply to my inner condition, because it can "space me out," I must be wary and totally aware. This line, this path, is like star-steps to fields of wonder.

It is not a binding experience, though there is the bond. It is not a locking-in experience. Instead,

it is a freeing experience, an urging me on, a firing me with a will to go "where my God sends me." It links me with the wonder of my life and all life, with the wonder of my being and with all beings — and it encourages me to great risk-takings.

And how do I know if it is right for me to have a sexual relationship? What are the signs? I can tell you of some I have discovered — though I am sure there are many more.

First, I must know that I meet him with whom I have a sexual relationship on the path of my Spirit — that we can communicate in that dimension. I must know I am linked with love: — for me, for him, for my Spirit. And I discover whether or not this is true through those lightening-like intuitions and words and symbols and acts — and after-images in the relationship.

Then I must continue to explore, sometimes hourly, sometimes daily, answers to these queries: Am I easy in my Spirit about continuing it? Am I hurting no one else? Does the center of my life continue to be *my* life, *my* Spirit, not him with whom I share the sexual experience? Does it enlarge me, expand me, enable me to see the world and others and myself in new dimensions? Does it bring me closer to the wonder and the mystery of myself and him and all of life? Does the relationship enable me to discover and transform the seed of war in me: the craving which leads to lust for possession, to disconnectedness from the moving, flowing life about me?

And foremost — is it intertwined with love — the love that wishes him to grow, wishes him to live, free of me? Do I, because of the relationship, discover the seeds of holiness which exist in everything more vividly, more easily? Does it open me out in love to everyone, instead of locking me in a one-to-one relationship? Is it a sacrament, i.e., do we, by our presence in one another's lives enable each other to develop our own uniqueness — to individuate more fully?

And finally, can I let it go? Can I let this dove of joy fly to my hand — hold it there for the moment, or whatever moments are allowed me, and then set it free to soar to its own destination, leaving me with the sweetness of greater knowledge, greater awareness for having experienced its presence?

If I can answer yes to all, or most of these questionings, then I move fearlessly (for if there is fear, I am jangled, out-of-tune, and I must stop) into relationship. For I know then, it is for the great creative purpose, and through it, I become a greater force for love and awareness in this universe in which I live. Gene Knudsen Hoffman

Simple Matters

E. F. Schumacher, a British economist and twenty-year member of the National Coal Board in England, recently visited the San Francisco Bay Area under the auspices of the American Friends Service Committee. He shared his ideas on small scale, simplicity, beauty and economy with economists, activists, educators, businessmen and people involved in building alternatives. In my view, Schumacher's work has many implications for our lives as Friends, as well as for the larger society. Schumacher is, in the truest sense of the word, a non-violent economist. I highly recommend his book, *Small is Beautiful: An Economics As If People Mattered*, available from the AFSC bookstore in San Francisco (2160 Lake St.) for \$4.00 including tax.

The people in the United States, comprising 5.6% of the world's population, are presently consuming 40% of the world's natural resources, but to what ends? Alienation, slums, unemployment, and war. In expressing the need for a new model, Schumacher asserts, "If 5.6% of the world's population can't be happy with 40% of the world's resources, the other 94% certainly will not be able to find happiness through the same method." He points out that the only way we in the United States can continue our present growth (doubling our consumption every ten years) is through dependency on natural resources from the rest of the world.

But what of the needs of those countries for resources for their own development? It is this clash which will continue to bring about conflict and war between us and the still underdeveloped world. Schumacher asks, "Why do we have the right to use up all of the world's resources for our own consumption?" He feels we need to stop our massive rate of growth in order to give us time to find ways to meet our needs while allowing the poor nations time to find ways to meet their elementary needs using their own resources. Continuing on our present course will lead to a phenomenal crisis twenty to fifty years from now when all the energy resources are gone. Then what do we do?

Schumacher strongly advocates the development of an intermediate, more human scale technology. This new technology would not rely so much on high-priced, complicated machinery, but rather on simpler tools, i.e., a hoe rather than an expensive tractor. He points out that in our present society with all of our labor-saving machinery, we seem to have less

leisure than most simpler societies. With an intermediate technology there would be production by the masses rather than mass production. The scale of technology would be conducive to decentralization, compatible with the laws of ecology, and gentle in its use of scarce resources — designed to serve humans rather than make people servants of machines. It would be a people's technology, available to all and not reserved to those who are already rich and powerful.

As a staff member of the American Friends Service Committee,* I am particularly interested in what relevance Schumacher's thoughts have for our work in the Peace and Simple Living programs. From what E. F. Schumacher says, it seems abundantly clear that an economics which encourages greed and "me first" values will end up inevitably in war. There simply are not enough resources for us all to be gluttons. We are using up the world's resources as if they were going out of style. The present ownership and distribution system tends toward a few owning and controlling most of the world's resources, while the many are barely subsisting.

A non-violent economics, on the other hand, would encourage non-exploitation of people and reasonable use of resources. Rather than greed and self-centeredness, it would encourage the values of sharing and cooperation. While modern economics stresses growth at any cost, non-violent economics stresses the wholeness of peoples' lives and the preservation of the environment for all to enjoy and use as needed, rather than waste for greed. In non-violent economics, you do not use irreplaceable resources unless this is absolutely essential; we would not run on capital instead of interest, as we are presently doing in our use of fuel. In non-violent economics, work is viewed as a way to express yourself creatively, produce something useful, and enjoy being with others. Thus, to organize work in a way which becomes boring, stultifying or meaningless makes no sense. There must be a congruence between ends and means.

It is really an exciting concept to think of economics "as if people mattered" instead of the present system where things and profit and bigness matter most. What a radical difference it would make if we applied non-violence to the economic realm of our lives, our values, and the economic institutions of our society. Schumacher is asking us not just to theorize about what is wrong with our present society, or only to dream about what a better society could be like. Rather, we should begin to develop now alternatives which are geared

to values such as small scale production, concern for the environment, worker and community ownership and control of the means of production. As cheap and plentiful fuel becomes no longer available, our whole way of life — big cities, high technology, large industries, agribusiness, the automobile, and truck transportation — will no longer be possible. He hopes, moreover, that in our ignorance of long-range radiation effects we do not succumb to the error of greed and burn the planet with nuclear residues.

Schumacher feels we need to develop examples of how to organize life in a more decentralized, simple, non-violent way. He challenges us to build a viable future in the present, introducing the concept of non-violence into the economic realm of our lives and institutions. When Schumacher is asked to suggest what people can actually do, he responds, "We can, each of us, work to put our own house in order." From that base will come the spiritual strength for building new alternatives. This is the real challenge!

David Hartsough

*David Hartsough is co-secretary of the Simple Living Program, AFSC-NCRO. —Ed.

Christmas As Usual?

Can we escape the consumerism and commercialism of Christmas? A group in Washington, D. C., has put together an excellent resource to help people find new life-supporting ways to celebrate all special events — *THE ALTERNATE CHRISTMAS CATALOGUE* (available at the AFSC bookstore, 2160 Lake St., San Francisco, for \$2). This catalogue is a "tool to alter our ways of thinking, spending, and living," and is already generating considerable social and economic power around the country. It begins with a call to simpler living, and a discussion of the myths and mistaken values that currently exist regarding celebrations in this country. "Celebration is big business! \$9.3 billion in retail sales last November-December were credited to 'seasonal variation.'"

The Catalogue offers a long section of examples of people- and earth-oriented groups to which money could be directed instead of personal gift-giving. It also describes many self-help craft groups and community-controlled enterprises which people can support, and offers ideas for homemade gifts. This is a provocative book to read NOW, before you walk to the store with Christmas-Club savings in hand.

Jan Hartsough

Book Review

A Quaker's Pilgrimage: An Autobiography by Paulina Bluth Hans, 207 pp., \$3.00. Available through Claremont Friends Meeting or at the AFSC Book Store, 980 N. Fair Oaks Ave., Pasadena, CA 91103.

Paulina Hans, now 85, has been a member of Claremont Meeting for the last 10 years. In *A Quaker's Pilgrimage* — a book she has been working on for many years — Paula records recollections of her growing-up years in a German Jewish family; the tragedies and deprivations during World War I; the "vision" that "made me a Christian" and a Quaker; the trauma of the Hitler years, including her personal witnessing of the "Day of Broken Glass"; her flight to England and the U. S. A. and the difficult period of adjustment to a new life. It is a simple, honest, straightforward story. (There's nothing devious about Paula!) Paula's gift for recollecting details captivates and holds the reader's interest.

Margaret Simkin

Film Review

A MEETING OF FRIENDS. Black and white. \$200. Rental, \$30. Tom Weidinger, The Meeting School, Rindge, New Hampshire, USA.

Tom Weidinger has done PYM and NPYM a service by filming "A Meeting of Friends" at Multnomah Meeting in Portland, Oregon. It could easily be your meeting or mine: potluck, wedding, retreat, peace march, meeting for worship. Three members are seen at their work, Quakerism being a way of life.

Old and new are beautifully tied together through the use of historical Friends' prints and the Shaker tune, "'Tis a gift to be Simple."

I have enjoyed it as a work of art, for you do have to bring your own responses to it. The camera lingers over faces and returns, so you may again study unhurriedly. Our meeting used it for seekers, who responded positively to the human qualities honestly portrayed. Meetings could use it as a basis of writing their own film script or as a spiritual search.

PAUL DAVIS
Corvallis Meeting

HEILMAN INTERVIEW*(Continued from page 33)*

Q. How did you feel about the PYM session on sex and human freedom, which you attended?

A. There was good communication between the young and the old. But there has been no real change in sexual conduct, although the exterior, or the visible, has changed. People are now more realistic about human needs and desires, rather than heavenly goals.

Q. There was a great deal of talk from younger Friends indicating promiscuity. Did this bother you?

A. I don't operate that way. I think it is looking for a way out, not being honest with yourself in really examining your own feelings about things other than sex. But there is another way of looking at it: it is testing reality a little, probing your own self by relating with a lot of different people. I don't think you can have as much discovery with many as with one person. You never get down to the nitty-gritty – which isn't related to sex. It is what you're accomplishing by being here. Why am I alive?

Q. Do you know how you have become acculturated over the past 16 years?

A. I have had it pretty easy. I haven't learned as much from direct talking as from example. That's the best way to teach a kid. Lately, there has been more talk with lots of people, which has changed my thoughts. Dad calls me a real conservative. But I think there is no pure self. We are a combination of the values which we receive from all over.

Q. Have you gotten double messages from the adults in your life? Say one thing, do another?

A. Many times. But I thought so especially at the time. Now, looking back on it, I don't see much inconsistency.

Q. Do you approve of the process which has happened to you?

A. Definitely. I intend to carry it on.

Young Friends

Young Friends of Pacific Yearly Meeting will be holding a New Year's Gathering again this year at Ben Lomond. It will be the weekend preceding New Year's, starting on Friday evening, Dec. 27, and ending on Sunday afternoon. Plan to arrive after dinner on Friday and bring a sleeping bag. If you think about it, drop me a postcard beforehand at 2013 Lincoln St., Berkeley, 94709, to let me know if you're coming, but it's not necessary to do so. Please bring a couple of dollars if you can to help buy food, but that's also not necessary since funds in our budget will cover expenses.

Carolyn Bradshaw, *Clerk*

BARNS INTERVIEW*(Continued from page 32)*

A. Well, I haven't gotten too much help from my parents. I have to decide. But the schools are all wrong. They preach instead of trying to understand. I am a person and want to be treated like one. The schools treat kids like beef cattle, just going through and being shipped off to somewhere else.

Q. Do you get double messages from the adults who surround you: actions different from their words, for example?

A. I sure do get lots of that. But I get another kind of double message, especially from my Dad. There is one set of rules for everyone else and another for you or for the group you are in. For example, skinny-dipping is fine for everyone else, but don't you do it. It is fine for other girls to go to bed with fellows, but don't you do it. So I go along, as long as I am living at home.

Q. Any final words?

A. I have a fair amount of freedom. The only thing I would change is, I'd like to be more truthful. But I can't even be too much more truthful and live with myself.

Learning From "Temoku"

You chocolate beauty hunting dog
Running in the tall tan weeds,
Springing over the roots of trees,
Sniffing down the duff on point
Toward squirrels.
Wiggling in the grass
You signal ecstatic discoveries.
Delighted by too many trails
You switch and double on the smells,
Re-trace the tracks scents take you,
Nosing into holes, digging in earth,
Chasing hunters' heavens.

Exuberant like you, and giddy
With delights, I, too, am wild
Tracking my private confusion of joys.
Running with movement and shadow
I pick up crossing scents and double
On my trails. A hidden network lures me
To side-trips and excursions.
What god will tell me heel
And whistle me toward home?
Or is there hunter's sense inbred,
Instinct toward heaven?
Where does the main way run?

Jeanne Lohmann,
September 1974

Sex in a Religious Context

I do not claim to understand why certain themes repeat themselves in cycles of interest within the Yearly Meeting, but there must be good reasons why the Junior Yearly Meeting interest group on "Human Freedom and Sexuality" was so well attended. Quakerism is a product of the reformation and the process goes on and on, freeing opportunities for creative innovation in every sphere of human action. Yearly Meeting has been a haven for many in finding others with whom to "try out" ideas and "try on" life styles within at least a partial group sanction.

Stewart Innerst noted last March at the Executive Committee Meeting that Yearly Meeting business seems to be shifting from matters of social concern to concerns of individual life styles, rights, and obligations. Friends have a built-in check and balance system which makes individual concerns also group and social concerns — hence, the involvement of Yearly Meeting in so many particulars of variety of life style. Throughout all history, human nature and sexuality have been the concern of religion. Ritual and restraint have been two of the methods used by religious bodies to manage these powerful human drives. Our young people, I think, are asking us to extend our concern beyond sexual satisfactions to the whole gamut of human freedoms related to friendship, acceptance by peers, prestige and power in relationships, values, and quest for personal identity.

It seems to become clearer now, as a result of about a century of research by anthropologists of the human scene, that man's ultimate religious situations don't change so much, that "religious man" as a species hasn't altered much, but the symbolic forms and acts which relate man to the ultimate conditions of his existence are changing significantly. One wonders both why the Yearly Meeting Discipline speaks not at all on attitudes of human sexuality, and what indeed it could say that would speak for Friends in general! Yet, human freedom and sexuality fall within the categories of religious concern by virtue of the fact that men and women cannot be indifferent to them or long evade confronting them, and yet cannot control and adjust to them in society by disregarding the attitudes of others.

Friends have relied on "example" as a way of transmitting values, yet most Friends would agree that "times they are a'changin'..." and Young Friends may indeed need to explore new paths in

relatedness. Some basic fundamentals may still be useful guides: be aware of and sensitive to the effects of one's actions on others, as well as clear in one's own motives. The hurt of deceit makes honesty of motives essential. With the personal re-interpretation of all creeds, and the acceptability of as many worlds as there are modes of perceiving them, life has become "an Infinite possibility thing." The symbolization of man's relation to the ultimate conditions of his existence is not the monopoly of a religious group, but such a group is one of those rightfully charged with some responsibility. Certainly, the Monthly Meetings and the Yearly Meeting should provide a favorable environment for the individual to work out his own ultimate solutions.

Marian Binford Sanders

PYM Interest Group Evaluation: *Women*

Approximately 100 persons gathered in Dryden Hall during the 1974 PYM session at the request of the Woman Friends Sharing Group to hear Ann Denham, an ordained Methodist minister, speak on the religious sources of sexism in the Bible; and later 80 people met to hear her concluding remarks, "Sisters, Brothers, and Others."

Ann spoke of rampant sexism in the development of western religious thought. She explained that while early civilizations commonly worshipped a female fertility Goddess, the Jewish and Christian religions are based on the supremacy of a strong male God. With many quotations from the Bible and other historical religious texts, she showed clearly how women have been demeaned and oppressed for centuries as a result of male-dominated religious institutions.

Religious language common even in the Society of Friends continues the concept of male supremacy in such phrases as "God the Father," and "The Brotherhood of Man." The psychological damage from being excluded from the concept of God is a serious handicap for women. True religious principles go beyond traditional patriarchal ideas that have subordinated women for centuries. It is important to develop religious values that support and honor women, and that allow men to step out of traditional roles. As we understand how out-dated sexist bias has warped our thinking, we can change our values and concentrate on achieving full human liberation.

Bonnie Richardson
Billie Hamilton

Letters

Overdensity-by-the-Sea
Sexagesima, 1974

Dear Editor:¹

Once upon a time there was a yearly meeting that wanted to be a Yearly Meeting. It tried and it tried and it tried. There also was a little engine that tried, but that is another story, you ingrates.²

It seems that this yearly meeting once rented a nudist camp to hold the annual festival of the light. One of the problems encountered was that they wanted to have permission to wear clothes. So they plenaried and plenaried and plenaried — for several years. At last it got on the agenda, and (far into the night) they tried to pass a minute. As the evening and then the morning wore on, the decibel count went up, too. One member-person kept shouting at the clerk (and we all heard it, too) that he “didn’t have unity with the there is no unity.” This no-unity with the no-unity business went on and on as this yearly meeting sometimes does.³ Finally, a person-member with a loud voice shouted, “The clerk is the clerk is the clerk is the clerk, and has been for 300 years.” After a few more desultory⁴ remarks including a threat to sue the yearly meeting for an infringement of the right to privacy⁵ the meeting adjourned with a moment of silence which was the first of the evening.

The moral is: Always try everything else before you try the good order of Friends.

Yours in love, Hank

E. Henry Spritzgarten III

1. and sub-editor; 2. which means, it is all in love; 3. and others too; 4. all in love; 5. not what you think, Buster.

Opportunity

Graduate students who are Quaker or in close sympathy with Quakerism and are looking for jobs are invited to meet with representatives from Quaker Colleges to discuss teaching opportunities: Tuesday and Wednesday, December 17 and 18, 1974, at the Quaker Hill Conference Center, Richmond, Indiana. For detailed information, write or call: The Friends Council on Education, 112 S. 16th St., Philadelphia, PA 19102, telephone (215) LO 3-1791 or LO 3-2752.

... THE EMPEROR'S NEW CLOTHES

(Continued from page 38)

Quaker rhetoric to feel bigoted if we question any kind of sexual behavior, it is time for Friends to join the little child in the folk tale and say loud and clear and embarrassingly that the Emperor isn't wearing any new clothes at all — the Emperor is naked.

William B. Edgerton

POSTMASTERS: SEND FORM 3579

FRIENDS BULLETIN

2081 Amherst St., Palo Alto, CA 94306

Second-Class Postage Paid at Palo Alto, California

When I Was Four

Now I am ninety. I was the oldest Friend, as nearly as I can learn, attending Pacific Yearly Meeting in August 1974 at Moraga, California. My memories of events among Friends include one in rural Illinois in 1888, when my father moved his family from the neighborhood of Elwood to Vermillion. Among the families then moving to Vermillion Grove was that of Milton Newlin and his wife Mary Jane. At the next Vermillion Quarterly Meeting that year, Mary Jane, a Recorded Minister, was in attendance, and I heard her preach. She took as her text this part of the tenth verse of Psalm 84: “I had rather be a doorkeeper in the house of my God than to dwell in the tents of wickedness.”

Due to the fact that I had lived in the country, I had never seen a tent. But Mary Jane Newlin's sermon led to my being impressed with the idea that the practice of a group of young men who always spent the Meeting Hour out on the grounds was a form of wickedness.

In 1921, thirty-seven years later, at a Friends Meeting in Newberg, Oregon, I met Mary Jane Newlin again and I told her of the enduring memory of her sermon I had heard when I was four years old.

Horace O. Cook